

dealing with crisis pregnancies, if you don't perform abortions, they would call that misinformation. In the other bill that is being discussed right now, they would fine you \$100,000.

I can't even begin to explain my emotion when I think, if you take the life of a child, there is pressure to say: We want Federal funding to take the life of a child. If you protect the life of a child, we are going to fine you \$100,000. Is that really where we are? Is that really what this debate has become?

This administration has quickly become the most pro-abortion administration in American history and has rapidly moved to accelerate abortions across the country, while millions of other Americans just ask a simple question: Does that child in the womb have the right to travel in their future? Do they get to live?

Some would say: No. They are terribly inconvenient. They need to die.

Others would say: Why don't we actually live by our values, including the right to life?

So while there is conversation about how to put a piece of legislation out that may very well protect individuals who are being trafficked to go to other States to get an abortion or all kinds of other issues that are there, I come back to the most basic thing: There is a child in this conversation, and maybe this body should pay attention to children as well and to wonder what their future could be to travel in the days ahead as well.

I look forward to the day when we are talking more about that little girl and less about misinformation.

I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I would ask for 5 minutes to respond.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I do appreciate my colleague from Oklahoma coming here to talk. I disagree with his argument, but I do appreciate his profound belief in what he is saying.

I think it is ironic that the issue here before us is really a States right issue. It is exactly what Justice Alito did in the Dobbs case and referred this issue to the States to make that decision, and all my legislation says is, respect my State. We are a choice State. We have made that decision as a State, and if women want to travel to my State to seek services and my providers want to provide those services and employers want to help women travel, then let the States do that. We shouldn't be impeding on those decisions.

So it is kind of ironic. I hear my colleagues talking about, in this case, let's take the emotion out of it, except when they want to put emotion into the issue, or let's take the emotion out of it when it is not convenient for the arguments they are making.

Let me also address a couple of things because now I have learned from some of my colleagues, really, the argument they are going to start making is that somehow this legislation is flying in abortions, which it absolutely is not. It is a States rights issue. And nobody is flying into my State to provide healthcare. The actual healthcare is already there.

The other thing I have heard, which is actually very offensive to me and I think to so many, is that somehow this is trafficking women. Well, let me tell you about trafficking. I know trafficking. I wrote the law to prevent sex trafficking and sexual exploitation in the State of Nevada for so many who were being sexually exploited across this country, to hold predators accountable, to make sure that they can become survivors. This is not trafficking. And for anyone to stand up and say that it is has a complete misunderstanding. And quite honestly, I will welcome you to the fight about human trafficking in this country and sexual exploitation of women and children across the country. That is so offensive. But I am not surprised because in this day and age, unfortunately, some of these radical ideas coming out of this Congress miss what is happening across this country.

A majority of Americans in this country support the right of women to choose because you know why? I don't know what it is like to step in their shoes and walk in their shoes and nor do you, nor does anyone here. I shouldn't impose my beliefs, my religion, my ideas on what they should do for their lives. None of us should. That is the freedom in this country. That is who we are when we stand for freedoms and liberties. It doesn't mean we get to pick and choose those freedoms and take away the rights of the very individual because we believe differently or our religion thinks that we should do differently. That is what we do when we come into this Congress and we all work together to the benefit of everyone and not erode their rights and their future and their opportunities. That is what this is about.

This legislation is very simple. Let's protect those freedoms. Let's make sure we protect those States rights and allow women, healthcare providers, and employers to actually support and help one another in this country. That is what this legislation does. To say otherwise is misconstruing, it is fearmongering, and a continuing erosion of the debate of the constitutional rights and the American rights in this country right now. And that is the problem with Congress.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON HEINZELMAN NOMINATION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Heinzelman nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 41, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 254 Ex.]

##### YEAS—50

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blunt	Hassan	Rosen
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hickenlooper	Shaheen
Burr	Hirono	Sinema
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	Kelly	Stabenow
Carper	King	Tester
Casey	Klobuchar	Tillis
Collins	Manchin	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cornyn	Merkley	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Ossoff	Wyden
Feinstein	Padilla	

##### NAYS—41

Barrasso	Hoeven	Risch
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Boozman	Inhofe	Rounds
Braun	Johnson	Rubio
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lee	Shelby
Crapo	Lummis	Sullivan
Cruz	Marshall	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Tuberville
Fischer	Murkowski	Wicker
Grassley	Paul	Young
Hawley	Portman	

##### NOT VOTING—9

Blumenthal	Leahy	Sanders
Cramer	Lujan	Sasse
Hagerty	Markey	Schumer

The nomination was confirmed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julianna Michelle Childs, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas.